The UN and the Vietnam Elections, P. 2

Just For Once

Negroes might wire the President to let a volunteer batallion of Negro troops march as a guard of honor through Mississippi with those who are taking up where James Meredith fell. Negro soldiers helped put down the revolt in Santo Domingo. They help man the "frontiers of freedom" in Germany. They fight in Vietnam. They ought just for once to have a chance to uphold the rights of man—and of their own people—at home.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIV, NO. 21 JUNE 13, 1966 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Freedom of the Press and the CIA

Two new disclosures have been added to our knowledge of the Bay of Pigs. One, by Mr. Clifton Daniel, managing editor of *The New York Times,* reveals how easily the President himself becomes the prisoner of events set in motion by the CIA and of the standards established to cover up its activities. In a talk to the World Press Institute June 1, Mr. Daniel told of a meeting at the White House several weeks after the Bay of Pigs when President Kennedy scolded newspaper editors for "premature disclosures of security information", mentioning among other items the *New York Times* story about the training of anti-Castro forces for that invasion by the CIA in Guatemala. But at the very same time, in an aside to Turner Catledge, executive editor of the *Times,* the President said, "If you had printed more about the Bay of Pigs operation you would have saved us from a colossal mistake."

Censorship by "Self-Restraint"

Jefferson would have loved that anecdote and felt that its implications were inescapable. But I see little evidence that they are understood. Certainly President Kennedy did not understand them, for he was pleading with the editors to print less rather than more about cold war cloak-and-dagger activities in the future. Nor, I am sorry to say, have adequate lessons been drawn from the incident by the *New York Times.* In practice, notably in its Vietnam coverage and comment, and despite White House pressure from both Kennedy and Johnson, it has grown more independent. But the editorial it reprinted last Sunday on "Freedom and the Press" as a guide-line is deplorably weak. The editorial appeared originally April 28, 1961, in response to Kennedy's post-Bay of Pigs demand for "self-restraint", i.e. self-censorship by the press. The editorial shows how far we have drifted from the spirit of the First Amendment. "No formula can be entirely satisfactory," it said. "Certainly censorship is not, and complete license is not, either. The best for the moment is to take seriously the President's request for self-restraint. Along with this ought to go greater accessibility of officials, so that newspapermen may have frank and informed advice on the harm that might come from revelation of a discovered secret." This is an invitation to be taken into camp. There is entirely too much of this "accessibility", this "frank and informed advice", in Washington. To suppress the truth in the name of national security is the surest way to undermine what we claim to be preserving. There is a Latin legal maxim—*justitia fiat, ruat coelum:* Let justice be done though the heavens fall. I would paraphrase it for newspapermen and say, Let the truth be told as we see it though officials claim the disclosure would cause the heavens to collapse upon them.*

Few Smiles Anywhere

"What the returning correspondent quickly observes after an absence of some eight months is a new surliness towards the foreigner. . . . Not long ago, a foreign smiling face would quickly break the ice. Now the unsmiling eyes turn aside."

—The Times (London) from its man in Saigon, June 4

"Now what I was hearing from all of those central Pennsylvania counties was that we've either got to end this war or we've got to find a way to settle it which is honorable to the United States or else we have no right being in there. I've never seen the people so frustrated and so disturbed."

—Sen. Hugh Scott (R. Pa.), on Pa. radio-TV, June 6

"Fewer Americans today express confidence in the way President Johnson is handling his job than at any previous time . . . [since] he has been in office . . . a chief reason is the Vietnam situation."

—George Gallup, Washington Post, June 5; his poll showed approval of LBJ dropped from 63% at beginning of this year to 54% in May and 46% in June.

The other new disclosure about the Bay of Pigs shows that intimate knowledge within the confines of a small elite is no substitute for untrammeled freedom of the press. The disclosure was made by Senator Russell of Georgia on the floor of the Senate May 16. Russell is chairman of that select little subcommittee of Appropriations and Armed Services which has jurisdiction over the CIA. The existence of this subcommittee is always cited against any proposal for stricter supervision, even so mild a one as Fulbright's for adding three

(*Continued on Page Four*)

*** "Reasons of state" was the excuse in 18th Century England for restrictions on reporting. In the landmark freedom of the press case against John Wilkes, Lord Mansfield ruled, "The Constitution does not allow reasons of state to influence our judgment. God forbid it should. We must not regard political consequences, however formidable they might be; if rebellion was the certain consequence, we are bound to say 'justitia fiat, ruat coelum.'" It's a sad day when we have to learn from George III's judges.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The UN Would Be Guilty of Colossal Gullibility If It Took Saigon's Invitation

What Is There to Observe in Elections Rigged in Advance?

Effrontery is the only word for the Johnson Administration's effort to get the United Nations to observe the South Vietnamese elections. The only effect can be to hurt the reputation of the UN in the minds of the unthinking. Asking the UN to observe elections in Vietnam is like asking the Warsaw Pact to observe elections in Mexico. The only international body on which both sides are represented is that established by the Geneva conference in 1954, as Senator Mansfield was quick to point out. Russia and France are sure to veto any such proposal. Why, then, make it except as another public relations phoney?

McCarthyite Election Standards

But this is not the whole story. The South Vietnamese government was careful to make clear that it was asking the UN not to supervise the elections but merely to observe them. There is quite a difference. The circumstances and terms make these elections a farce. General Ky has said that if they should return an Assembly which wanted to negotiate peace the military would overthrow it. "The Election Law drafting committee," the government controlled radio announced in Saigon May 31, "decided yesterday that any person who works for the Viet Cong and for neutralization, directly or indirectly, will not be eligible to run for the constituent assembly."

For the military McCarthyites and hard-line fanatics who run the show in Saigon that is broad enough to bar any but the most fervent pro-war candidates. It is to be noted in this connection that the only two parties which seem to be able to operate at all in South Vietnam today, the only two ever mentioned there or in the news dispatches, are the Dai Viet, an extreme right ultra-nationalist movement, and the NQVDD, known as the South Vietnamese Kuomintang party because it was long a satellite of Chiang Kai-shek's movement and shares its outlook.

A No. 1 question is how do you have a free election without a free press? How do you have free choice if candidates cannot express themselves freely? What is there to observe in an election of this kind? Observing such an election is like observing a rigged roulette wheel with no power except to check the croupier's arithmetic.

McNamara Sees Buddhist Pacifist

The Buddhist poet-monk, Thich Nhat Hanh, whom we interviewed in Saigon (see the Weekly for May 16) was received in friendly audience by Secretary of Defense McNamara June 2. Next day Thich Hanh held a press conference at which he presented a 5-point program for peace. This called for an end to bombing North and South; limitation of all military action to the defensive—a cease-fire if the Viet Cong respond; a "convincing demonstration" of U.S. readiness to withdraw over a specified period of months"; " a clear statement of U.S. desire to help the Vietnamese people have a government truly responsive" to their will and an offer to aid in reconstruction, "such aid to be completely free of ideological and political strings." He said the war was killing "far more innocent peasants" than Viet Cong and that while he was anti-Communist "I do not declare that in Vietnam. People who read my writings know that I am anti-Communist but I am afraid of identifying myself with the dollar-making people. Anti-Communism has become a real business in South Vietnam."

Mansfield Comes To Cambodia's Defense

Our military-intelligence establishment has long been hostile to Cambodia and itching for a chance to invade that poorly defended little neutral country as the Germans did neutral Belgium in World War I. Everyone concerned with elementary fairness will be grateful to Senator Mansfield for his latest statement, which attempts to correct the hostile propaganda campaign of Pentagon and CIA. The Senate majority leader said that "on the basis of specific knowledge" he knows of no firm basis for the effort to picture Cambodia as a sanctuary for Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops. Senator Mansfield performed a service to peace in calling attention to Prince Sihanouk's offer to let the International Control Commission set up by the Geneva convention, police his borders and also investigate the allegation that his port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship arms to the rebels and North Vietnam. This offer has been ignored generally by the press and of course by our military.

Johnson Bestows A Founding Father on Vietnam To Write Its New Constitution

One of the cutest ploys of the White House was to send Prof. John P. Roche of Brandeis to help the Vietnamese write a Constitution. He is now in Saigon. His mission there was confirmed by the Washington Post May 27 through Administration sources. Prof. Roche is a former national chairman of the ADA who split with it over the war. He has become one of the intellectuals on whom the White House relies. An article by him, "Why I Oppose Vietnam Critics", was reprinted with permission from the Detroit News in the April issue of Air Force and Space Digest, organ of the Air Force Association. There he was introduced as "a distinguished liberal thinker."

The Constituent Assembly which is supposed to write a Constitution for South Vietnam has yet to be elected, but an outsider, an American, and a pro-war liberal at that, is already in Saigon helping the military junta frame a satisfactory document. This is how it will look to the Vietnamese, and they may not consider this a model of self-determination.

Vietnamese may recall as few Americans will that the Diem dictatorship was inaugurated under a Constitution an American expert helped him write in 1956. The story is told in Bernard B. Fall's, The Two Vietnams. The expert was Prof. J.A.C. Grant of California. This charter for what was then supposed to become a democratic state obligingly provided that the President of the Republic could by decree suspend virtually all civil rights "to meet the legitimate demands of public security and order and of national defense." It was under such emergency powers that Diem filled his concentration camps with opponents of all kinds and extended his own term in office until he was overthrown in 1963. After that experience, the Vietnamese may not care to have another American Founding Father, especially one picked for them by Lyndon Johnson.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some Cynical Reflections on Our Man Balaguer's Victory Over Juan Bosch

Why Dominicans May Be Conditioned to Voting As We Want Them To

On the eve of our armed occupation of the Dominican Republic in 1916, Woodrow Wilson's Ambassador assured its people "in the opinion of the United States there is no grievance which now exists or can exist which justifies resort to arms". The people could always "demand a fair ballot". In the future baseball should provide them " a real substitute for the excitement of revolutions." We offer these gems to Lyndon Johnson's ghost writers; he might like to use them again.

Fifty Years of Misery

Little more than a year after a liberal candidate we opposed was defeated in a U.S. supervised election (this sounds like eternal recurrence!), we had to send in the Marines to put down a popular revolt. They stayed eight years. Six years after the Marines left, a constabulary chief they had trained established a dictatorship and ruled for 30 years more. In the 50 years since the Marines first landed, the Dominicans have only had 12 unstable years of precarious freedom. The only peace they have known was when they accepted rule by us or a dictator satisfactory to us. The lesson is that the way for Dominicans to avoid trouble is to give in to U.S. wishes. Perhaps—if it was an honest election—that is why a majority voted for Trujillo's lifelong retainer, our favorite, Balaguer, the choice of both the American and Dominican military over Juan Bosch. Baseball is still a safer pastime for Dominicans than politics.

The U.S. operates on a kind of heads we win, tails you lose principle with the Dominican Republic, as with many of our Latin neighbors. We are always plaguing them, as Bolivar once complained, "with misery in the name of liberty." When a dictator arises who plays ball with U.S. oil and sugar interests, we forget about liberty. When a liberal gets himself elected, as Bosch did in 1962, we look the other way as the military overthrow him. If the people revolt and try to restore him and constitutional government, we stifle the revolution by armed intervention as we did last year. Then we hold elections. If our favorite wins, all is well until popular dissatisfaction threatens to overthrow him. If the man we oppose wins, we stand aside and let the military get rid of him. This has been the familiar pattern of Dominican politics under the U.S. shadow for almost a century. How free a choice is it when a small country knows from bitter experience that unless it elects a man satisfactory to U.S. business and military interests, it may face a U.S. encouraged military takeover? And that when the military takes over, they may shoot those who opposed them?

So there is a rational explanation for Bosch's defeat. Perhaps it is a correct one. But we find it hard to believe that the Johnson Administration, with all the secret "contingency" funds and secret agents with which we now so plentifully supply the Presidency, really kept hands off in this election, when a victory for Bosch would have been a defeat for Johnson.

Political Satire Returns to the Capital

For the first time since the loyalty purge and the cold war, a professional group here, the Washington Theatre Club, has put on a political satire, Spread Eagle. It takes on the Vietnamese war, the Johnson Administration, the Kennedy brothers and Mayor Lindsay of New York. E. Y. Harburg, Russell Baker, Eve Merriam, Sue Lawless, Herb Sufrin and Richard Lingeman are among those who wrote the skits. One of the best, "1,000 Nights", satirizes the Tonkin Bay reprisal raids when we were threatened "by remarkably hostile radar blips." Rusk's "multi-lateral sampan force" also appears in this skit. Another, by Russell Baker, has a Senatorial hawk explaining that "the only way we can achieve our goal of unconditional peace is through unconditional war." This musical revue will play in Washington only until June 26 but might be coaxed into the summer theatre circuit. We applaud and cheer it.

Johnson's (Too) Masterly Sleight-of-Hand at the Civil Rights Conference

The White House Conference "To Fulfil These Rights" was a model of manipulated public relations. The delegates were hand-picked and the recommendations prefabricated. The main feat was to shut off discussion of Vietnam. The Administration wheeled out Walter Reuther and Arthur Goldberg to assure the delegates at a press conference that foreign policy had no place in such a conference. But many of the moderates would have appreciated some discussion of just how the escalating costs of this escalating war could be reconciled with the kind of major steps necessary to head off serious racial conflict at home.

Herbert Hill of the NAACP indicated the real dimensions of the task. In a sober and detailed report, he outlined a 10-year plan of housing, health, education and urban renewal to cost $50 billion a year and create at least 6 million new jobs. This includes proposals to meet the growing water and transit needs of urban areas. But no such bold and creative program is thinkable in the atmosphere of hostility to social reform created by the war, even if room for it could somehow be made in a budget swollen by war costs and shadowed by fear of inflation.

The main concern of those who ran the show was to prevent real discussion. But here again, even from the Administration's point of view, the White House outsmarted itself. The Conference left many delegates confused and despairing. Much might have been learned from them, but what they had to say was confined to a multitude of small committee hearings, too many for adequate coverage. The Administration gave way on its original idea of permitting no recommendations and no votes, but refused to allow a plenary session where much useful criticism from the localities and many constructive suggestions might have had a hearing.

One of the subjects thus muffled was criticism of the FBI in civil rights. This was expressed in several committee sessions. Dr. Arnold S. Trebach, director of the Howard University Human Rights Program, said the recommendations on administration of justice in the Conference report could not be implemented "unless we can deal" with the problem of the FBI. He called for J. Edgar Hoover's replacement as soon as possible "not by a man of his own choosing but by an individual of the calibre of a Supreme Court Justice." He called Hoover and the FBI the "number one untouchables of our society" and proposed a Congressional investigation of the FBI to determine "its impact on civil rights." This, too, was brushed under the rug.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of What Public Use Was Senator Russell's Private Knowledge?

(*Continued from Page One*)

members of Senate Foreign Relations to it. Stennis of Mississippi, another defender of the CIA, praised Russell's supervisory work and said he gave CIA activities "the most rigid attention and the closest scrutiny."

So They Didn't Consult Him!

In the Bay of Pigs affair the CIA must have decided that this scrutiny was too close for comfort. Russell, in a remarkable burst of candor, told the Senate "I only wish I had been consulted, because I would have strongly advised against this kind of operation if I had been. *That may have been one reason I was not consulted. My position was well-known.*" He went on to say, "I knew about the plans, but I did not know about the timing of it." Perhaps the timing was kept from him for fear that he might protest to the White House as he could have done if he had known the invasion was imminent. This is hardly a testimonial to the efficacy of the supervision he exercises. Nor does it warrant the complacency with which the Georgian blamed the "clamor" for stricter control on "a segment of the press which feels that it, and it alone, can properly direct the Government of the United States." As it happens, those who first exposed the preparations for the Bay of Pigs—the Guatemalan newspaper *La Hora,* Ronald Hilton of the now defunct Hispanic-American Institute at Stanford, *The Nation* and Paul P. Kennedy of the *New York Times*—turn out to have been better protectors of the public interest than Russell and his subcommittee.

Even now Russell only hints at the whole truth. "I did not think the operation had a chance of success," he told the Senate, "unless it had active support from the United States," i.e. unless the Cuban exiles were supported by American ships, planes and troops. What he says leads us to believe that the invasion was intended to draw the U.S. itself into war with Cuba. "I do not think the President was completely responsible," Russell said. "There was confusion about the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There was a series of tragic errors. The CIA made a mistake, in my opinion, in telling the President they thought this operation had a good chance of success. My own view of it . . . was that no 1500 men who ever lived or fought could be put ashore under the situation that then existed in Cuba and expect to get a foothold there. But the Joint Chiefs interlaced their views with all kinds of suggestions about support by U.S. forces. There was a carrier just out of sight, off the shores of Cuba, over the horizon. I am not too sure whether our ships were to be used as support." It is to President Kennedy's credit that he drew a firm line against direct U.S. military involvement. But what was the good of Russell's private knowledge as a Senator if he could neither make it public nor act upon it? Not the least of the indictments against the existence of a cloak-and-dagger agency like CIA is that it forces us to fight again a battle we thought had been won with the framing of the Constitution. Must we now reargue the case for a free press and free discussion as the only reliable safeguards of the country's security? If they are indeed incompatible with the kind of secret activities carried on by the CIA in violation of international law, then the answer is to end these activities, not to limit freedom of the press.

More on Father Quynh and The Military Junta

We report an odd sequel to the story in last week's issue about the manifesto issued in Saigon by the Catholic refugee leader, Father Quynh, and a Front of Citizens of Various Religions calling for the resignations of Generals Thieu and Ky. Readers will recall that this manifesto was made public on May 26, that the only paper which published it was suppressed next day and that a day later Father Quynh broadcast an ambiguous disavowal. Now we learn that on June 3, Father Quynh called a press conference in Saigon and in almost the same words and on behalf of the same joint religious group issued a new call for Thieu and Ky to step down. The only difference was that he also called on the Unified Buddhists "to stop immediately some extremists who are fomenting trouble." This seems to have precipitated new pressure on Father Quynh. On June 7 the government-controlled radio broadcast an interview in which Father Quynh said he had resigned from the 7-man Presidium of the hard-line Catholic Citizens Front, and did not speak for it.

You Can Still Start A Gift Sub With Stone's Four On-the-Spot Reports from Vietnam and Cambodia
(They'll Soon Be Exhausted)

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/13/66

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*
Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED